

REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 26, 2004, claims 1, 2, 11, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,323,601) or Petelin et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,641,033) in view of Shelton (U. S. Patent No. 5,596,792).

Claims 3, 12, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Cristich (U. S. Patent No. 5,743,754) and Barnick (U. S. Patent No. 5,232,383).

Claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Johnson et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,247,737) or Erickson (U. S. Patent No. 4,535,565).

Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Weber (U. S. Patent No. 4,107,770).

Claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Jacques (U. S. Patent No. 6,483,023) and Kim (U. S. Patent No. 6,355,878).

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Hee (U. S. Patent No. 5,004,425).

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Tharp et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,837,769).

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Cristich, Barnick, Johnson, Erickson, Jacques, and Kim.

Page 1 of the Office Action of May 26, 2004 noted in box 10 that drawings in the present application were filed on October 7, 2003. However, the box indicating whether the drawings were accepted or objected to by the Examiner was not checked.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner indicate whether the drawings filed on October 7, 2003 are acceptable or whether changes need to be made. Applicants will make any necessary changes to the drawings should any corrections be required.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton. Respectfully, the combination of references does not disclose a UV lamp system in which a portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly is attached to the RF screen and a complementary portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly is attached to the irradiator. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least Figure 5 of the drawings that shows the ball stud 40 attached to the RF screen 10. Other drawings in the present application also show a portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly attached to the RF screen. For instance, Figure 11 shows the spring clip 48 attached to the RF screen 10, Figure 14 shows the metallic finger gasket 60 attached to the RF screen 10, Figure 15 shows the magnetic fastener 64 attached to the RF screen 10, and Figure 16 shows the quarter-turn type fastener 66 attached to the RF screen 10.

Both Klein and Petelin disclose UV lamp systems, but the two references do not disclose either a snap-fit fastener assembly or an RF screen that is releaseably

attached to an irradiator. Shelton discloses a light guard attachment clamp used for attaching a wire grid to an edge portion of a sheet metal light fixture (see Shelton at column 1, lines 5-8). A screw 28 is used in order to secure the hinge clamp 10 to the edge portion 14A of the light fixture 16 (see Shelton at column 4, lines 50-56). The edge wire 44 of the wire grid 12 is snapped into and out of engagement with the hinge clamp 10 (see Shelton at column 4, lines 60-63). As such, the hinge clamp 10 is attached to the edge portion 14A of the light fixture 16, and no part of the hinge clamp 10 is attached to the wire grid 12. An edge wire 44 of the wire grid 12 is snapped into place between the detent 42 formed between fingers 40 and 38 of the hinge clamp 10 (see Shelton at column 4, lines 28-32; and Figures 1 – 3).

Claim 1 of Applicant's application calls for a portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly to be attached to the RF screen and a complementary portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly attached to the irradiator. As discussed, this structure is not disclosed in Shelton which instead discloses the entire hinge clamp 10 to be attached to the light fixture 16 while no portion of the hinge clamp 10 is attached to the wire grid 12.

Additionally, it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton in order to arrive at the structure of claim 1 of Applicant's application that calls for a portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly to be attached to the RF screen and a complementary portion of the snap-fit fastener assembly to be attached to the irradiator. Shelton discusses prior hinge clamps that are configured in a manner in which a portion of the hinge clamp is permanently affixed to the wire grid (see Shelton at column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 1). This type of hinge clamp remains attached to the wire grid when the wire grid is separated from the light fixture (see Shelton at

column 2, lines 1-5). Shelton explicitly states that a problem with this type of configuration exists during manufacturing in that attachment of the hinge clamp to the wire grid causes the resulting assembly to be more expensive and take longer to manufacture (see Shelton at column 2, lines 11-13). Further, arrangements in which the hinge clamp is attached to the wire grid results in an assembly that cannot be easily attached to a light fixture in the field by an operator (see Shelton at column 2, lines 13-16).

The entire point of Shelton is to provide for an arrangement in which the hinge clamp is attached to an edge portion of the light fixture and not permanently affixed to the wire grid in order to avoid the aforementioned problems (see Shelton at column 2, lines 17-21; and column 3, lines 6-10). Modification of the hinge clamp 10 of Shelton so that a portion of the hinge clamp 10 is attached to the wire grid would go completely against the entire teaching and point of the reference.

If the proposed modification of a reference would render the invention being modified unsatisfactorily for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In our instance, modification of Shelton so that a portion of the hinge clamp 10 were attached to the wire grid 12 and a complementary portion were attached to the light fixture would render Shelton unsatisfactory for its intended purpose because the resulting device would suffer from the disadvantages stated in the reference and would remove any of the stated advantages. It would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a reference in a manner the reference states as being inferior and disfavored.

Further, both Klein and Petelin specifically indicate a fixed screen assembly, and do not make any reference towards the screen being designed for easy removal much less one that is even designed for being removed in the first place. Modification of either of these references so that the screen were instead releaseably attachable would further result in a modification that goes explicitly against the teachings of the references that call for a fixed screen assembly. The assignee of the Petelin patent, Fusion Systems Corporation, has not modified their design during the last 30 years in which they have held their patents in this technology. Therefore, if it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the designs of Klein or Petelin to include a snap-fit fastener assembly so that the RF screen were releaseably attachable, Fusion Systems Corporation would have developed such a design in the last 30 years. Additionally, the assignee of Klein, Nordson Corporation, recently re-engineered a screen assembly for microwave powered lamps, but Nordson did not modify this screen assembly in their re-engineered assembly to include a snap-fit fastener assembly to releaseably attach the RF screen as called for in claim 1 of Applicants' application.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims that depend from claim 1 (claims 2-10) are also in condition for allowance. The rejections to claims 2-10 are made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

As stated, claim 11 was rejected over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton. Applicants have amended claim 11 in order to call for a reflector and RF screen assembly in which a portion of one of the snap-fit fasteners used with one of the

flanges and a portion of one of the snap-fit fasteners used with the other one of the flanges are attached to the frame of the RF screen and complementary portions of the snap-fit fastener are attached to the flanges. Although not exact, this amendment is similar to the amendment made to claim 1 of the present application, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 defines over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 11 is in condition for allowance and that all claims that depend from claim 11 (claims 12-20) are also in condition for allowance. The rejection to claims 12-20 are made moot due to the allowance of claim 11.

Claim 22 was also rejected over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton. Applicants have amended claim 22 in order to call for a reflector and RF screen assembly in which one of the male or female connectors is attached to the RF screen and the complementary male or female connector is attached to the reflector. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least Figures 5 and 6 of the drawings that show the ball stud 40 attached to the RF screen 10. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 defines over the combination of Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is in condition for allowance.

As previously mentioned, claim 21 was rejected as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Cristich and Barnick. Additionally, claim 21 was rejected as being unpatentable over Klein or Petelin in view of Shelton and further in view of Cristich, Barnick, Johnson, Erickson, Jacques, and Kim. Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections to claim 21. Respectfully, it

would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the hinge clamp of Shelton to result in a ball stud located on the frame. Shelton specifically seeks to avoid a configuration in which any part of the hinge clamp is attached to the wire grid (see Shelton at column 2, lines 9-16). The entire point of Shelton is to provide for an improved connection in which no part of the hinge clamp is attached to the wire grid (see Shelton at column 2, lines 28-32).

It would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton to include the ball stud of Cristich or Barnick to be located on the wire grid. Doing so would defeat the entire point of Shelton, which is to avoid configurations in which any part of the hinge clip is attached to the wire grid. It would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a reference in a manner that is explicitly stated as being disfavored by the exact reference sought to be modified. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is allowable over the combinations of the aforementioned references.

None of the references made of record in the Office Action of May 26, 2004 that are relevant to a reflector for an ultraviolet lamp system disclose a snap-fit fastener. The references that relate to electrical multi-pin snap connectors, medical snap connectors, and modular chandelier with plug-in arms, etc. are not relevant art to the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at his convenience should he require any information or wish to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.A.

August 24, 2004
Date

Neal P. Pierotti

Neal P. Pierotti, Esquire
Reg. No.: 45,716

Post Office Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602
Telephone: 864-271-1592
Facsimile: 864-233-7342